

Mr. Smith,

In today's political and business climate, from my perspective outside of the professional media, I have come to question the intentions of major news organizations to present the public with a truthful, balanced and fair view of world events. Investigative journalism is all but gone. Given the recent revelations of intelligence mistakes made by the Bush administration and the corruption in corporate accounting shaking major corporations, it is clear to me that news is not necessarily truthful simply because it comes from people in authority. In fact, those in authority now have an even stronger burden to prove their assertions due to the mishandling of American trust. We are becoming immured to the reality that information is always tainted with ulterior motives. Sources lie, as in our government's hiding of facts about the war or the fraud perpetrated by analysts who lied about stocks. On top of that, it is increasingly prevalent that news gathering organizations are part of the problem. Not conducting true investigations of an objective nature, but simply being pawns of those in power and their biases. Most of my colleagues and friends share the same suspicion that what is offered as news through the major outlets is in fact either wrong or biased...extremely biased...in favor of the people putting forth the information and their hidden alliances. Regardless of whether the journalist is reporting accurately.

In the case of Jon Leiberman, I can only see this action as being tainted with political bias. His firing leads me to believe that intelligent dialog and open, critical analysis of content that is part of true news gathering is not allowed within Sinclair. A news organization should have its dissenting opinions. The Supreme Court has them, and I believe any body worthy to call itself fair and balanced and honest must have dissenting opinions. Openly dissenting...not just privately dissenting. Moreover, calling a worker "disgruntled" in my vast experience is usually a front for internal corruption. That word really speaks to a labeling of an individual as having dysfunctional emotional issues and a brewing obsession to harm a company without any provocation. Since the term is used so much by big corporations, it has a meaning almost opposite its intentions, speaking to the truth of the whistleblower and his struggle for what is right. The term has become synonymous with Joe McCarthy calling people Communists to advance his personal agenda. Sadly, what could have been a crowning moment for Sinclair Broadcasting in standing tall enough to foster true dialog and debate over a politically charged issue instead has turned into a

petty attempt by your company to attack a reporter for a conscionable objection. It wrecks of big corporate allegiances and cronyism.

Given the accelerating distrust of American media by the public, what Sinclair did gives fuel to the prevailing perception even more. I tend to support Mr. Leiberman and his moral stance on objectivity and integrity in the news, precisely because of how you handled this situation. Instead of embracing Jon Leiberman, you fired him. Sinclair showed restriction, instead of honoring pluralism. It has become fashionable to tacitly allow a bias these days...as in FoxNews' conservative slant...and to only promote one point of view, yet what we most need now in the media is not more polarization but a decision to be balanced...truly balanced. To be balanced means to embrace dissent. Open dissent. That was not done in this case...and I believe it has harmed the integrity of Sinclair as a news reporting organization.

Regards, Steven